



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JOURNAL OF MYCOLOGY

A Periodical Devoted to North American Mycology. Issued Bimonthly; January, March, May, July, September and November. Price, \$2.00 per Year. To Foreign Subscribers \$2.25. Edited and Published by

W. A. KELLERMAN, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.

EDITOR'S NOTES.

In the April No. of the Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club is published a new caste of the American Code of Botanical Nomenclature, being the 1904 Philadelphia canons with a few amendments. These changes are made in part to meet the requirements of the 1905 Vienna Code; but some of the rules and recommendations of the Vienna Congress are not acceptable to the members and alternates of the Nomenclature Commission of the Botanical Club of the A. A. A. S.

In Mycology as in other branches of Botany, uniform and concerted action among taxonomists is greatly to be desired; and all efforts leading to stability and uniformity are to be commended. Our Commission is insistent on the principle of types which the Vienna Congress failed to recognize. Another contention of the Americans — consistent and commendable — is that nothing should be arbitrary or exceptional in application. Objectionable therefore, is the action of the Vienna Congress in excluding a large number of generic names from the operation of all nomenclatorial rules, and in requiring diagnosis of new species to be in the Latin language after January 1st, 1908.

We have several comments to make on the new code, though space requires that one or two only be given here. Canon 1, should, we think, be omitted. There is a general agreement approximately if not essentially uniform as to the meaning of *species* in Nature — and even the conception of genus is not so divergent but that the work of specialists generally secures approval. We see no advantage in an attempted definition of species — surely the rules and practices in nomenclature are not dependent on the theoretical statement. Again, a genus may exist even if there is but one species and not a group, and any one of the entire series mentioned in Canons 3 and 4 may be similarly restricted — then wherefore “group” the representative? We think it adequate to substitute for the four Canons mentioned, the mere statement that the groups in ascending series recognized in botany are species, genera, tribes, families, orders, classes and divisions; and names of a lower group or of intermediate groups, when necessary, may be formed from the preceding by using the prefix *sub*.